

University of Groningen

The organisation of oblivion

De Baets, Antoon

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:

1995

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

De Baets, A. (1995). *The organisation of oblivion: Persecuted and censored historians in Africa, Asia, and Latin America*.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

18th INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF HISTORICAL SCIENCES

SPECIALISED THEME 1

'POWER, LIBERTY, AND THE WORK OF THE HISTORIAN'

MONTREAL, CANADA

27 AUGUST - 3 SEPTEMBER 1995

THE ORGANISATION OF OBLIVION

PERSECUTED AND CENSORED HISTORIANS

IN AFRICA, ASIA, AND LATIN AMERICA

A Report

Presented by

Antoon de Baets

History Department

University of Groningen

The Netherlands

18th INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF HISTORICAL SCIENCES

SPECIALISED THEME 1

'POWER, LIBERTY, AND THE WORK OF THE HISTORIAN'

MONTREAL, CANADA

27 AUGUST - 3 SEPTEMBER 1995

THE ORGANISATION OF OBLIVION

PERSECUTED AND CENSORED HISTORIANS

IN AFRICA, ASIA, AND LATIN AMERICA

A Report

Presented by

Antoon de Baets

History Department

University of Groningen

The Netherlands

SUMMARY

This report includes information about the censorship of history and the fate of over 360 persecuted historians in almost 70 countries since 1945. For each country, the data are presented in three categories: general information about the censorship of history; historians censored or persecuted outside the historical field; historians censored or persecuted inside the historical field. It is proposed that a Network of Concerned Historians be established, made up of people who are ready for solidarity campaigns, and a Working Group be formed as a link between this Network and human rights organisations that can provide action-oriented information about our persecuted colleagues.

INTRODUCTION

‘Or is it true that a nation cannot cross
a desert of organised forgetting?’

Milan Kundera
The Book of Laughter and Forgetting
(London 1982) 159

This report includes information about the censorship of history and the fate of over 360 persecuted historians in almost 70 countries since 1945. It should be considered as an instrument against two forms of oblivion.

Historians should not forget the courage that many of their colleagues show when they are trying to write history in the face of tyrannical power that wishes to impose its view of the past and suppress all others. They have suffered - and still do today - censorship, dismissal, exile, imprisonment, torture and execution. This report is an appeal to the international community of historians to combat the persecution of its members and to join the efforts of human rights organisations which are already campaigning for them.

The past is not the monopoly of the historians. All citizens concerned with the past should struggle against the attempts to obscure those episodes of the past unwelcome to the authorities in office. There exists an individual and collective right to history. Whoever pursues that right should do so in the spirit of truth, even when the truth is unpopular or painful. However, historical truth can never be decreed. Absolute truth is the companion of oblivion.

Neither the past nor the historians who try to uncover it should fall into oblivion. Therefore, this report is dedicated to the memory of all those historians and citizens concerned with the past who have defended the right to history, sometimes at the risk of their own life.

Methodological Remarks

In this report, censorship of history has to be taken as the systematic *control* of the content or exchange of

information and ideas concerning the past imposed by, or with the connivance of, the authorities.¹ This form of censorship can be directed against a historical work in all its stages or against the producers or consumers of this work. The report does not, however, include manifestations of historical propaganda, which is the systematic *manipulation* of information concerning the past imposed by, or with the connivance of, the authorities. Not only is historical propaganda a much broader phenomenon, it is also much harder to prove. Although in practice propaganda and censorship are both aimed at silencing criticism, there is one crucial difference between them: propaganda tries to impose one view through manipulation, and ultimately through lies, whereas censorship tries to suppress alternative views through control, and ultimately through violence. In other words, propaganda does not necessarily imply censorship, but censorship is always accompanied by propaganda.

It is important to realise that when the aim is to control the past, the censor actually attaches importance to both professional and non-professional producers of history, and to interpretations of the past in either written, spoken or visual form. Indeed, the report shows that popular history is as much a target of censorship as academic history, and probably even more so. Therefore, a flexible definition of the term 'historian' is certainly necessary. Here historians include, on the one hand, all professionals and trainees in the historical sector in the broad sense (i.e. historians *appellation contrôlée*, archivists, archaeologists, but also students of history), and, on the other hand, all authors of popular or academic historical works, regardless of their training or profession (i.e. journalists, politicians etc. provided they have been active in the historical field). Comprehensive as this definition may seem, it does not include the regular work of journalists. However, it is fully recognised that the work of journalists - sometimes called 'the first rough draft of history' - has an important value for history in an indirect sense: censorship of the press will affect the volume and quality of sources at the disposal of future historians.

Although censorship of history is a phenomenon of many times and places, this report is limited to the last fifty years (1945-1995) and to so-called non-western countries of Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, Asia and Oceania. The report is part, however, of a larger project which encompasses also the remaining geographical areas. Bearing this in mind, it follows that the absence of an entry in this report on a particular country does not imply that no censorship of history has taken place there. As a rule, only explicit information about the censorship of history has been taken into account and inclusive evidence has been avoided. This means that information about the censorship of broader categories than historians (e.g. academics, intellectuals) that could include historians but do not necessarily do so, has not been judged sufficient evidence to justify an entry. This was the case for several countries. Likewise, the space devoted to a particular country, or the number of cases listed, should not be considered an index of persecution.

The information in the report is catalogued under the country responsible for the persecution, *not* under the country of origin of the historian or the country where the historian suffers from the consequences of the persecution.² Cases prior to 1945 are not included, unless the historians have also been victims of censorship or

¹ This definition is derived from general definitions of censorship as discussed by S. Hampshire and L. Blom-Cooper, 'Censorship?', *Index on Censorship*, 1971, 4: 55 and M. Scammell, 'Censorship and Its History: a Personal View', in: *Information, Freedom and Censorship: The Article 19 World Report 1988* Ed. K. Boyle and M. Piette (London 1988) 10.

² E.g. the Iranian 'Alī Shari'atī, who died in London in mysterious circumstances, or the British citizen Salman Rushdie, against whom Ayatollah Khomeini issued a *fatwa*, are both

persecution after 1944. To the best of my knowledge, the information is up-to-date until 1 July 1995.

The evidence has been clustered in three categories:

Category A *General Information About the Censorship of History.*

Category B *Historians Censored or Persecuted Outside the Historical Field.*

Category C *Historians Censored or Persecuted Inside the Historical Field.*

Within each category all information is organised in strict chronological order. This is necessary because of the large time span covered and the gaps of time between the various cases.

Category A contains information about the censorship of history not related to particular historians.

Category B gives information about the persecution of historians due to their activities outside the historical field. This category provides a glimpse of these activities and is, first of all, a modest contribution to the history of intellectuals. The history of persecuted historians is part of cultural history. However, this category has been included for other reasons. As historians reflect on their work and the world they live in, their commitments outside the historical field, e.g. in politics, journalism or human rights, can be inspired by their work inside the field.¹ Our data strongly suggest that this is frequently the case, although the influence of concrete historical views is generally hard to verify. Interestingly, the reverse may also be true: politicians and journalists may come to the conclusion that they need a firmer historical basis for their work and become amateur historians. Sometimes, this process of reflection is triggered by the persecution itself. Imprisonment and exile constitute a total breach with the life they previously led and the large amount of time suddenly available can lead to a fresh interest in the past, which, if conditions permit, leads to the study and writing of history.² It is truly remarkable how frequently this has been the case. In short, historical work and other activities can be interwoven to such an extent that it becomes almost impossible to assign a single motive to the

catalogued under 'Iran'.

¹ **Wang Dan (China) could be an example.**

² **For the writing of history in exile: *passim*, for the writing of history in prison, see e.g. Jawaharlal Nehru (India), Pramoedya Ananta Toer (Indonesia), Adolfo Gilly (Mexico), Govan Mbeki (South Africa), Jit Phumisak (Thailand); for the teaching or telling of history in prison, see e.g. Fidel Castro (Cuba), Pramoedya Ananta Toer (Indonesia), Suleiman Mohamed Soail (Sudan). These prison reflections on history and time acquire special importance in view of the fact that prisoners generally call the loss of the sense of time one of the greatest dangers of prison life; see e.g. Liana Benavides Grütter (Nicaragua).**

persecution.¹ Thus category B and category C sometimes overlap.

Category C covers the historians censored and persecuted because of their activities within the historical field. As this is the most important category, the aim was to make the inventory as complete as possible. However, the report is far from comprehensive: much of the information was fragmentary. Doubts about whether or not to include a case have generally been resolved in favour of inclusiveness. Several reasons account for the imperfect evidence.

First, censorship often takes the form of 'minor' harassments or career restrictions. Professional and economic repression, such as loss of employment, revocation of academic degrees and responsibilities, restrictions on travel abroad and contacts with foreign scholars, is much less frequently reported than physical repression. In addition, it is possible that some historians prefer their cases not to be highlighted as cases of censorship or persecution.

Second, censorship normally takes place in an atmosphere of secrecy.

Third, ideally censorship tries to enter the mind of the historian. Therefore the most efficient, widest-spread but least visible form of censorship is self-censorship. Moreover, it is difficult to distinguish the cautious historian who prefers to remain discreet from the historian who engages in self-censorship.

Fourth, as already stated, inclusive information has been avoided. In situations of large-scale repression, historians are almost certainly among the victims; but the scale often makes detailed individual information unavailable.²

Fifth, when the repression continues for many years, it may prove hard to decide whether a historian who was forced into exile as a child and pursued his education abroad should be included or not.³ More generally, it is often impossible to find out whether a stay abroad is voluntary or not.

Sixth, human rights organisations did not begin the systematic collection of relevant data until the 1970s, sometimes earlier. Their reports were the main sources of information here.⁴ They were supplemented

¹ **Caio Prado Júnior (Brazil), Albert Adu Boahen (Ghana) and Walter Rodney (Guyana) might be examples.**

² **Cambodia from 1975 to 1979 and Uganda from 1971 to 1979 are probable examples. For Uganda, see A.A. Mazrui, 'Subjectivism and the Study of Current History: Political, Psychological and Methodological Problems', in: *The Methodology of Contemporary Africa* Unesco ed. (Paris 1984) 30-32.**

³ **Tsering Shakya (China) is an example. This applies to several Tibetan, Kurdish and Armenian historians.**

⁴ **I want to thank the following organisations for their encouragement and information: American Association for the Advancement of Science (Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility), Amnesty International, Article 19, Human Rights Watch, Index on Censorship, International PEN Writers in Prison Committee, UNESCO, World University Service. The following colleagues have provided me with useful suggestions for which I am very grateful: Víctor Hugo Acuña Ortega, Pieter Boele van Hensbroek, Inge Brinkman, Marc De Tollenaere, Michel Doortmont, H.A.J. Klooster, Kees Kuiken, Margreet de Lange, Héctor Pérez Brignoli, Michael Riekenberg, Ingrid Sennema, Arturo Taracena Arriola, Daniel Woolf. In the seminars on censorship of history and related topics which I have directed at the University of Groningen since 1990, I have had stimulating discussions with my students. I want to acknowledge my deep appreciation for their enthusiasm. My work**

by data from historical and biographical dictionaries and from historiographical surveys. Whenever available, the censored works and the autobiographies of the victimised historians, or interviews with them, were consulted.

Although all these sources provide a wealth of information, they inevitably contain many lacunae which make it difficult to verify whether a given intellectual or academic is a historian or not, and whether the declared motive for persecution, if known, is also the real motive.

In addition to the imperfect evidence and the fact that cases may have escaped our attention, it should be noted that no attempt has been made to describe general patterns of repression or the overall climate for freedom of expression into which the individual cases fit, although, whenever possible, some background has been provided. Above all, this report is case-oriented. The cases could be compared to stars at night: some stars (persecuted historians) are visible, many are not; and observation of the starry sky is a valid method of orientation in the night (the general pattern of repression 'behind' the historians).

It should be emphasised that the report describes only one aspect of the life of the historians and does not give a complete picture of their activities. The reader is referred to the sources listed in the notes for more detailed information. In general, it is difficult to ascertain the real motives for the choices that the historians have made in times of repression and, therefore, moral judgements concerning their resistance, silence or collaboration are seldom relevant. While studying the cases, I often admired the courage of the historians and the quality of their historical work. However, I want to make clear that I do not necessarily share or support the views which have been censored. This principle of distance applies to all cases, but it will be most obvious in two instances. The first is the persecution of historians who had previously denounced their colleagues. Indeed, the report contains some information about such cases. Sometimes their fate proves the capriciousness to which the propaganda historian is subjected, sometimes it reveals the cruel pressure put upon the historian to betray his/her dissident colleagues.¹ The second instance, of a different order, is the censorship of falsified history, such as the denial of the Holocaust. That such abuses of history should be challenged is beyond doubt; whether they should be censored, is not.²

Avenues of Analysis

The report indicates that censorship of history is wide-spread and multi-faceted, and occurs in widely diverging political and historiographical contexts. Some examples will show that, even with the gaps discussed above, the data permit many avenues for comparative reflection and analysis.

Observing the side of the censors, one is immediately tempted to detect preferences in their strategy. In

would have been impossible without the professional assistance of the personnel at the Groningen University Library. Finally, I want to extend warm thanks to my colleague Ingrid Sennema who carefully revised the text.

¹ See e.g. under 'China'.

² See e.g. under 'Namibia'. On the question of judicial punishment of Holocaust denial, see: P. Vidal-Naquet, *Assassins of Memory: Essays on the Denial of the Holocaust* (originally French 1987; New York 1992) 138, and J-D. Bredin, 'Le Droit, le Juge et l'Historien' and G. Kiejman, 'L'Histoire Devant Ses Juges', both in *Le Débat*, 1984, November: 93-111 and 112-125.

many countries, contemporary history is certainly the most dangerous period of study.¹ But in some countries, earlier periods of history constitute the focus of official attention.² In yet other countries, the origins of the nation³ and concomitantly archaeological findings⁴ are sensitive topics. Difficult access, neglect and destruction of archives are sometimes vital expressions of the government's strategy.⁵ A very efficient form of censorship is intimidation: some historians have been attacked in public, either by the President, the Prime Minister or other high-ranking officials.⁶ History is certainly not a matter of indifference to the highest dignitaries. It is truly remarkable how many of them have either studied history, written historical works or demonstrated their special interest in history in some other way.⁷ History is also of great concern to unofficial groups. A surprising feature of the report is the involvement of non-governmental organisations in many countries, sometimes allied to the government, in actions of persecution.⁸

¹ See e.g. Argentina (general); Brazil (general); Ghana (Albert Adu Boahen); Japan (Ienaga Saburô); Mexico (general); Nigeria (Kole Omotoso); Syria (general); Zaire (general); see also F. Luna, 'Oficio y Responsabilidad del Historiador en la Argentina de Hoy', *Todo Es Historia*, 1985, 224: 89-90.

² See e.g. China (Wu Han and many others); India (textbook controversy).

³ See e.g. Gu Jiegang (China); see for a pre-war example the Japanese historian Tsuda Sôkichi (1873-1961), in: L. Boia ed., *Great Historians of the Modern Age: an International Dictionary* (New York 1991) 454-455; and Yun-tai Tam, 'Rationalism versus Nationalism: Tsuda Sôkichi (1873-1961)', in: J.S. Brownlee ed., *History in the Service of the Japanese Nation* (Toronto 1983) 165-188.

⁴ See e.g. Afghanistan (Ralph Pinder-Wilson); Ethiopia (Desmond Clarke, Don Johansen); Libya (general); Rhodesia (general); Sudan (general and Osama Abdel Rahman al Nur and others).

⁵ See e.g. Argentina (general); Egypt (general); Rhodesia (general); Turkey (general); see also Mazrui 1984: 37-39.

⁶ See e.g. Eduardo Galeano, by the Argentinian authorities on television and in the press; Wu Han and Jian Bozan, in speeches of Chairman Mao Zedong (China); Walter Rodney, by Prime Minister Hugh Shearer in a debate in the House of Representatives broadcast live throughout Jamaica; Thomas Karis, Tom Lodge, Mzala, Gerard Maré, Georgina Hamilton and Shula Marks, in speeches of Chief Mangosuthu Buthelezi (South Africa), Nabîh `Aqil, by a member of the National Assembly (United Arab Emirates).

⁷ Leaders with a degree in history: Mangosuthu Buthelezi (South Africa); Juan Natalicio González (Paraguay); Alpha Konaré (Mali); Leslie Manigat (Haiti); Julius Nyerere (Tanzania); Juan Perón (Argentina); Jânio Quadros (Brazil); Soekarno (Indonesia); Eric Williams (Trinidad and Tobago); and, according to some sources, Muammar al-Qaddafi (Libya). Leaders who wrote a work or held important speeches with historical contents: Habib Bourguiba (Tunisia); Pierre Gemayel (Lebanon); Ho Chi Minh (Viet Nam); Jomo Kenyatta (Kenya); José López Portillo (Mexico); Mao Zedong (China); Jawaharlal Nehru (India); Turgut Özal (Turkey); Sâddam Husayn (Iraq). Many leaders have shown their interest in history in other demonstrable ways: see e.g. Fidel Castro (Cuba) in this report. See also A. de Baets 'Herauten van een Groot Verleden: de Geschiedvisie van Derde-Wereldleiders [Heralds of a Glorious Past: the Historical Views of Third World Leaders]', *Groniek* June 1994: 6-21.

⁸ See e.g. Egypt (Farag Fouda, Said al-Ashmawi); India (Mushirul Hasan; Irfan Habib; M. Kalburgi; Sadique Hussain); Israel/Lebanon (Abdul-Wahhab Kayyali); Japan (Ienaga Saburô); South Africa (Floris van Jaarsveld); Sri Lanka (Sabarotnam Sabalingham); Sudan (Na'um Bey Shuqayr); Turkey (Server Tanilli); United Arab Emirates (Nabîh `Aqil); Zambia (Robert Papstein).

Predictably, the reactions of the censored were as diverse as the strategies of the censors. Historians used five major methods to get around censorship: keeping silent; switching to 'safe' topics of research¹; expressing indirect criticism through the use of historical analogies²; going underground, or leaving the country³. Some courageous historians followed another way, the way of confrontation. They openly protested against the attempts to curb academic freedom and one of them even sued the state in a famous case of history textbook censorship.⁴ These historians did not avoid the conflict but, on the contrary, became attracted to the official taboos. One or two historians even shifted their specialised research towards the eras and topics under embargo.⁵ Faced with such stubbornness, censorship does not suppress alternative views but rather generates them, and, by doing so, undermines its own aims. Moreover, it stimulates alternative channels for disseminating dissident opinions about the past. When history is censored, every other form of expression, even graffiti, becomes a potential vehicle for historical messages. Sometimes, censorship of history has an important heuristic value *a contrario*: like propaganda, it will generally leave intact as much of the past as possible and concentrate on key issues and interpretations of history. Ironically, it is frequently proof *a contrario* of historical consciousness as well.⁶

The actions of the authorities and the responses of the historians lose their personal character when the conflict becomes the object of public concern. The report provides four examples of public debate in the realm of popular history and school history in particular. Indeed, it is the wide reach of history education that makes it an important political issue. History textbook controversies took place in India in 1977-1978, in Japan in 1982, in Colombia in 1989 and in Mexico in 1992.⁷ In all these countries, the press was the main forum of the controversy, and parliamentary debates about school history were held in India and Japan, and possibly also in Mexico. Everywhere, large groups of historians were mobilised to express their opinion. The controversies were accompanied by censorship attempts in all of the countries save Mexico, where it was apparently more a debate on the admissibility of official propaganda. In Japan the controversy acquired an international dimension because other countries disputed the portrayal of history in Japanese textbooks.

In each of the four cases, the controversy constituted the most visible manifestation of a deeper rooted conflict. In India it was the clash between secularist and communalist views of history, in Colombia a struggle between conservative and progressive views of history, in Japan a conflict between those who wanted a positive portrayal of Japanese history and those who also wanted to discuss its dark sides, and in Mexico a collision between those who wanted contemporary history to support the ruling party and those who resisted this. In India, Colombia and Mexico, it was a conflict between traditional and modern methodologies as well. Serious

¹ See e.g. China (general); Egypt (ʿAbd al-Rahmân Zakî; Muhammad Sabrî; Muhammad Shafiq Ghurbâl).

² See e.g. China (*passim*); Indonesia (Pramoedya Ananta Toer); Iran (ʿAlî Sharîʿatî); Syria (general).

³ See e.g. Argentina (Emilio Ravignani and several others); Paraguay (six examples in category B).

⁴ See e.g. Argentina (Enrique Barba); Brazil (Sérgio Buarque de Holanda); Japan (Ienaga Saburô). See also below, under 'history textbook controversies'.

⁵ See e.g. Ghana (Albert Adu Boahen), Japan (Ienaga Saburô).

⁶ See for a clear example: Malawi (A); see also G. Baudot, 'Conscience Historique et Ecriture de l'Histoire dans le Mexique Précolombien', *Storia della Storiografia*, 1984, 5: 8.

⁷ See entries under these four countries for details.

disagreement emerged there about the shift of emphasis in the textbooks at stake from the history of great men towards the history of the masses and of daily life. The textbook controversies clearly show that history is an important issue whenever it concerns the public at large and future generations. They not only reflect very different interpretations of the past, but also, ultimately, different underlying conceptions of national identity.

What Can We Do?

The report demonstrates that history is an important, dangerous and fragile subject. We now have to ask ourselves what historians whose academic freedom is not in danger can do to help their persecuted colleagues. The answer is simple, the reasons for it are complex. We should join the efforts of human rights organisations which are already campaigning for them. Before we consider the affinities of human rights work with the work historians do, it may be useful to broadly distinguish three stages in time.

First, there is the 'time of repression', the period in which the violation of historians' rights takes place. Second, there is the 'time of memory', the time span in which the persecuted and their contemporaries remember past abuses. Third, there is the 'time of history', the time when the victims and perpetrators have died and the memory of the abuses is kept alive only in the work of historians. It is clear that, from stage to stage, the efforts of human rights organisations generally diminish and those of the historian augment. Therefore, their efforts complement each other.

Human rights organisations work for freedom of expression for all, including historians and persons who want to commemorate past abuses. In addition, they provide part of the source material for future historians who want to study the 'time of repression'.

In their professional ethics, historians share the most important aim of the victims of persecution and the human rights organisations: to know the full truth. Historical truth is the natural extension of the living truth, i.e. the truth pursued by the victims and their allies when they are still alive. Historians should study the history of persecution. The social responsibility of the historian who wants to be truthful and is free to do so¹ is threefold.

It is a responsibility towards the past because the memory of past abuses of power and the struggle waged against them has to be kept alive. When historians fail to do so, the 'time of history' may turn into a 'time of oblivion and denial'. It is also a responsibility towards the present because contemporary human rights research and reporting have to be based on a historical background. Finally, it is a responsibility towards the future because historians can contribute to the enhancement of human rights awareness, by publishing their findings and teaching them.

However, many historians do not wish to wait until they see their professional efforts transformed into a higher level of respect for human rights. The present report testifies to the fact that historians have engaged in human rights activities during the 'time of repression' and the 'time of memory'.² It is true, historians have

¹ See F. Bédarida ed., 'The Social Responsibility of the Historian', *Diogenes*, 1994, no. 168: especially 2-3, 28, 61, 74, 81-82.

² Most of them can be found in Category B. See e.g. Afghanistan (Hasan Kakar); Brazil (Hermógenes Da Silva Almeida Filho); Chile (Pablo Arturo Fuenzalida Zegers); South Africa (David Webster). The original charter of the human rights organisation *Charta 77* in

occasionally campaigned together for their censored or persecuted colleagues.¹

The time has come to give these efforts a structural basis. We hope that the following proposal will be discussed at the Congress and elsewhere:

1. *A Network of Concerned Historians* who are ready for solidarity campaigns should be established.
2. *A Working Group* should be formed which can serve as a link between this Network of Concerned Historians and human rights organisations that can provide action-oriented information about our persecuted colleagues. The information could be disseminated by electronic mail or fax. The present author is prepared to function as a temporary contact person and coordinator.

With a structure such as this, protests could be lodged with the authorities, contact could be established with the persecuted colleagues by putting them on our mailing lists, inviting them to give lectures, write papers, exchange letters, or become members of a committee or editorial board, by supporting them financially, or facilitating the publication of their banned work. Cases could be publicised in newsletters or professional journals and at conferences, even when they take place in the country responsible for the persecution. Drawing attention to the fate of persecuted historians gives them some degree of immunity and protection. At the very least, it warns governments that their actions do not go unobserved and uncondemned in the outside world.²

Twenty years ago, the Czechoslovak historian Vilém Prečan sent an Open Letter to the participants in the Fourteenth International Congress of Historical Sciences in San Francisco. In 1970 he had been dismissed from the Historical Institute of the Academy of Sciences in Czechoslovakia on the grounds of 'political unreliability'. In his letter of July 1975 he wrote: 'I declare my determination to realise myself as a human being and as a worker in the field of historical science anywhere in the world, on one condition only: freedom of scientific investigation. I ask you, esteemed colleagues, not to refuse me your solidarity and to help me as far as you possibly can. I say this quite openly. Without your solidarity and your support I have no chance of remaining free to resume my work as a historian'.³ Vilém Prečan went into exile in West Germany in 1976. When the right to history of our colleagues is in danger, ours is too. It is our responsibility to use our academic

Czechoslovakia carried forty signatures of historians: one sixth of the total; see: K. Bartosek, 'Les Historiens dans l'Histoire', *La Nouvelle Alternative*, 1986, 1: 47.

¹ See the history textbook controversies mentioned above.

² See 'The Five Commandments', *Index on Censorship*, 1975, 1: 17-18; American Association for the Advancement of Science, *Directory of Persecuted Scientists, Engineers, and Health Professionals* (Washington 1994) 3-4; see also *The Lima Declaration on Academic Freedom and Autonomy of Institutions of Higher Education*, Article 16: 'All institutions of higher education shall provide solidarity to other such institutions and individual members of their academic communities when they are subject to persecution. Such solidarity may be moral or material, and should include refuge and employment or education for victims of persecution.', in: World University Service, *Academic Freedom 1990: A Human Rights Report* (London 1990) 189-190.

³ V. Prečan, 'Bound, Gagged and Robbed', *Index on Censorship*, 1975, 4: 57; German original in: V. Prečan, *Die Sieben Jahre von Prag 1969-1976: Briefe und Dokumente aus der Zeit der 'Normalisierung'* (Frankfurt 1978) 214-222. See also his follow-up letter in *American*

freedom on behalf of those to whom it is denied. Only then can the organisation of oblivion be successfully challenged.

CALL FOR INFORMATION

This report is part of a project which covers the whole world. Please send any corrections or additions to the cases listed or any new information on historians and countries not covered to the address below, for inclusion in a subsequent update.

CALL FOR ACTION

Historians interested in building a *Network of Concerned Historians*
please contact:

Dr. Antoon de Baets
Department of History
University of Groningen
P.O. Box 716
9700 AS Groningen
The Netherlands

Tel.: (31.50) 63.60.31 or (31.50) 26.79.23
As of 10 October 1995: (31.50) 363.60.31 or (31.50) 526.79.23

Fax.: (31.50) 63.72.53
As of 10 October 1995: (31.50) 363.72.53

E-mail: debaets@let.rug.nl

Antoon de Baets (b. 1955) worked for Amnesty International's former Publications Bureau in Costa Rica (1980-1982), obtained a Ph.D. degree in history from the University of Ghent, Belgium (1988), and is currently employed as an assistant professor of contemporary history at the University of Groningen, the Netherlands. He has published mainly about historical popularisation (*The Walk-Ons of History: How the Past of Other Cultures is Represented and Remembered*, Antwerp and Hilversum 1994; in Dutch).